

City Moves Civil Defense Center to Hall of Justice

TUE NOV 2 - 1962

By FRED GARRETSON

Oakland's Civil Defense officials are giving up their nationally-known emergency city hall under Woodminster Amphitheater to move into new disaster headquarters in the heart of the city.

The reasons: the center in the new Hall of Justice's basement is more easily accessible by staff personnel and more easily serviceable by other emergency facilities.

Abandonment of the Woodminster shelter means the end of a "showcase" Civil Defense facility.

City Mgr. Wayne Thompson says the new location at 477 Seventh St. is better for directing efforts in case of earthquake or "accident" where the city doesn't get a direct hit.

"Wooaminsters is away from the place where officials needed to run the Emergency Operating Center would be working in the daylight hours. It would take time to assemble there," Thompson said.

"Almost 90 per cent of the phones come in on overhead wires which could be easily destroyed, even by a storm. It's not in operation 24 hours

a day, and a lot of water got in there during the storm," he said.

During the storm Thompson directed activities from the downtown city corporation yard until the phones failed, and then from City Hall. Woodminster wasn't activated.

The downtown location is in a basement of the part of the Hall of Justice occupied by the Police Department, licensed as a shelter for 3,000 people. It could be staffed 24 hours a day. Emergency food, parking, freeway access, city equipment and full time police radio facilities are readily available, Thompson says.

It's easily accessible for the assembly of personnel. It will also be the regular communications center for the city with teletype and radio contact with the rest of the state, he says. It will have a full telephone system as well as taxi-cab and public utility radio facilities.

Woodmnster had most of the same facilities, including scores of telephones, but they stood idle and were used only

It is larger and better equipped than the state shelter at Yountville, from which 14 Bay Area counties would be ruled in case of a disaster, says Bill Ward Jr., state regional civil defense chief. Yountville would be the disaster operations state capitol if Sacramento is destroyed.

Ward says Woodminster in many ways compares favorably with the federal disaster headquarters at Santa Rosa which would become the "Little White House" for seven western states in case of war.

While Oakland's new disaster headquarters will occupy only a 15-by-30-foot room, "We can expand fast if we have to," said Hansen. "We have a full square block under the Hall of Justice complex plus a tunnel under the freeway." He expects the move to be completed "before the end of the year."

The future of Woodminster

possibly as an alternate emergency center, a neighborhood fallout shelter or disaster police assembly point, will be discussed at a Civil Defense and Disaster Council meeting at 2 p.m. Wednesday in room 315, City Hall, Hansen said.

Oakland May Lose ~~mil. Red~~ TRE DEC 21 1962 Shelter Supplies

Oakland may lose emergency supplies for 113 fallout shelters with space for 90,000 persons because it can't come up with the money to move the stockpiles from one place to another.

The supplies, now cached at the Oakland Naval Supply Center, must be moved within 90 days or they go elsewhere.

Lt. Charles Hansen, the city's civil defense chief, has asked for \$22,896 to transport a mountain of food, water and medical equipment from the warehouse to the 113 buildings designated as shelters.

But, City Manager Wayne Thompson told the City Coun-

cil yesterday, a tight budget may forbid Hansen's request from being answered — and thus leave the stockpile to be shipped elsewhere.

This includes 2.6 million pounds of emergency biscuits, 100,000 cans of water and medical kits.

Hansen said that the paper work necessary to free the stocks is almost completed.

Navy Comdr. William J. Jannesen, acting head of the distribution program, said once that clears through Washington there will be no federal bar to Oakland's picking up the food, except for its own lack of money to move it.

Picture, Page 17

CITY RANKS HIGH IN SHELTER SPACES

BY TRAVIS MAY 23 1963

The city of Oakland now has more fallout shelter spaces marked with shelter signs and stocked with emergency supplies than do 19 states of the United States, including the entire state of Illinois.

New figures illustrating Oakland's leadership in the national civil defense program came to light today when Allan K. Jonas, Director of the State Disaster Office released figures showing that California now leads all other states in fallout shelter preparations in existing buildings.

California has marked and stocked 701 buildings, of which 113 are in Oakland. Only Los Angeles, with 137 buildings, is ahead of Oakland within the state. Long Beach is third with 69 and San Francisco fourth with 66.

Oakland not only is ahead of the entire state of Illinois, which includes Chicago and Cook County, not only in buildings marked, but Oakland also has stocked three times as many "shelter spaces" for individuals as has Illinois.

"We decided there was a job to do, rolled up our sleeves and did it," said Oakland Police Chief Ed Toothman. Toothman had high praise for Lt. Charles Hansen, the man in charge of Oakland civil defense operations, noting Hansen's "diligence and persistence" in doing the job.

The city has done this much without any extra appropriations, by using policemen, jail trustees and volunteers, Toothman noted.

Oakland's shelter program outstrips the entire states of Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, Delaware, Mississippi, Tennessee, South Carolina, Illinois, Louisiana, New

Mexico, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Arizona, Hawaii, Nevada and Utah, Jonas' figures show.

Oakland has 50,000 "shelter spaces" prepared with food, water, medical, sanitary and radiation detection supplies, state officials said, all of them in buildings which Navy engineers said had "as-is" shelter potential.

The state as a whole has prepared 571,000 such spaces. Los Angeles is ahead with 144,000 spaces. Even though San Francisco used fewer buildings than Oakland, it listed almost twice as many shelter spaces that are in bigger buildings.

Oakland Tightens Defenses

SEP 16 1968

The City of Oakland has tied up its 17-year-old law on civil defense, eliminating a reference to "giving assistance to the enemy," but strengthening the city manager's hand in dealing with domestic disturbances such as riots.

City Manager Jerome Keithley, who is also designated as the city's civil defense director, said the Oakland action had nothing to do with the recent proclamation in neighboring Berkeley.

There, because of demonstrations, a state of "civil disaster" was declared and at least one constitutional right, that of freedom of assembly, was temporarily suspended. There were 43 arrests, chiefly for "loitering."

The effect of the Oakland action, voted into law by the

Oakland Tribune
A RESPONSIBLE METROPOLITAN NEWSPAPER

Mon., Sept. 16, 1968 13

city council last Thursday, is to remove some restrictions on the type of "emergency" rules the city manager can invoke.

The former civil defense ordinance passed as an emergency measure in the apprehensive early days of the Korean War, on Feb. 20, 1951, made it a violation of law to break rules so as to "give assistance to the enemy; to imperil the lives or property of inhabitants of this city; or to prevent, hinder or delay the defense or protection thereof."

Under the change, it is now a violation of law to "do any act forbidden by any lawful rules or regulations" issued under this "disaster" ordinance.

Asst. City Atty. George Cahalan says there is no question that the change gives the city more power to deal with civil disorder.

He and Keithley agreed that, under the ordinance, should it be adjudged necessary, freedom of assembly probably could be suspended.

But Keithley went on to add, "Any decision I would make, I would have a city attorney by my side. I have to play them by ear when I find them."

The charter does require, however, that any such "disaster" rules laid down by the city manager "must be confirmed at the earliest practicable time by the city council."

Keithley said the suggested law change came from the city attorney's office, brought about by a review of the city's civil defense or "disaster" apparatus ordered at the time of last October's anti-Vietnam War demonstrations at the Oakland Induction Center.

Henceforth, the Oakland city manager, after declaring a state of disaster, may issue such rules for the conduct of the citizenry as he sees fit, restricted only by the term "lawful."

Marshall Krause, attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union, in San Francisco, points out that, even if the "lawfulness" of an order is challenged in court, often the order has been in force for days and many arrests have been made under such a rule.

Krause said the ACLU presently has a challenge of the Berkeley disaster proclamation before the U.S. District Court, but added that he does not know what its fate will be.

The ACLU contends that Berkeley City Manager William Hanley seized more power than was needed or that he legally had, to cope with the situation here. Krause said.

Civil defense for the Eastbay in shambles

FEB 4 1979

OAKLAND

by Scott Winokur

Staff Writer

A decade and a half after the six-year flurry of U.S. civil defense activity prompted by the launching of Sputnik in 1957, the Carter administration is attempting to revive a program designed to save millions of lives in the event of nuclear war.

Judging by its current status in the Eastbay, however, civil defense as we know it may be too moribund to revive.

Two-thirds of Oakland's 300 shelters lack life-sustaining supplies because the federal government stopped restocking all shelters in 1963. In the years that followed, emergency rations—chiefly crackers—turned rancid. Many water drums rusted out.

Medical supply kits were cannibalized by people who had access to the shelters. Survivors with anything worse than a headache would be in serious trouble today.

Also, unless they brought their



own oxygen supplies, radios and flashlights, survivors would find themselves in airless, totally darkened environments completely cut off from the rest of the world.

Although they were designed to save lives, the shelters are like tombs—terribly crowded tombs. The last time federal engineers paid attention to the question of occupancies, during the Kennedy

administration, they decided people required only 10 square feet to survive, barely enough room to lie down.

All of Martinez, they claimed, could fit into the basement of that city's Veterans Administration Hospital. But the population of Martinez grew and today 20,870 people would have to cram into a 66,200-square-foot area. That's 3.17 square feet per person. In a nuclear attack and for up to two weeks afterward, Martinez residents would have to stand cheek by jowl, much like BART commuters during the rush hour.

"Civil defense isn't in good shape. It's been neglected for years," says Tony Romero, deputy director of emergency services for Oakland.

The result, he contends, is that 70 percent of Oakland's population would die in a nuclear attack today.

Adds Alameda County civil defense chief Howard Garrigan:

"People in government haven't wanted to talk about civil defense because that's like the 50s all over again. They'd rather talk about earthquakes."

"The official posture has been that total, massive destruction is unthinkable and neither side would do it. So, in effect, we're all hostages."

Eighty-five percent of Alameda County's "hostages" would die "if we got hit with a nuclear war this afternoon," says Garrigan.

In Contra Costa County—the nation's 49th most unsafe county in terms of its vulnerability to fallout—nearly 80 percent of the population would be affected in a nuclear attack.

Public fallout shelters—the Eastbay has only a few score private shelters—could accommodate half the county. But most of the shelters would be safe just a day or two, although it's a full two weeks before you can go outdoors again after a nuclear attack.

Perry says most survivors would have to flee the shelters in 48 hours.

Continued back page, col. 4

There's a bright spot, however. Although they run an extremely high fallout risk, Contra Costans would be better off than many U.S. citizens in a mass evacuation. Relative safety, says Perry, could be found only an hour's drive or a day's walk to the north.

"On a scale of one to 10, if the others areas are one, I'd say we're two," he estimates.

U.S. officials permitted civil defense to languish in the mid-60s because they believed an apparent easing of tensions between the two major world powers had lessened the need for a thoroughgoing program.

Additionally, a truly adequate in-place protection program always had been viewed as too costly, and a far-reaching evacuation plan never was developed.

That's changing now. The Carter administration recently announced long-range defense goals including the expenditure of as much as \$2 billion annually for civil defense, eight times the peak outlay of \$250 million in 1963 and about 20 times the current annual expenditure.

The USSR, by comparison, is said to spend \$2 billion annually on a civil-defense program capable of protecting its entire population.

But some observers believe there is a purely political—and, possibly, shallow—motive for this nation's abrupt resumption of a course of action so reminiscent of the Cold War era.

Government officials say approval of a new strategic-arms limitation treaty with the Soviets may depend on the administration's ability to convince congressional conservatives that the United States isn't weakening in its resolve to match or surpass the Soviets in all defense matters.

Carter's enthusiasm for civil defense could wane, however, if and when he wins congressional support for a new arms accord, according to some observers.

But assuming the new U.S. program does go through, the increased expenditures wouldn't be for shelters.

The administration wants to provide a home away from home for 80 percent of the U.S. population in the event of nuclear attack. People in urban target areas would be evacuated to the countryside. People in the countryside would take a deep breath and make room for the refugees, who'd increase regional populations 500 to 1,600 percent.

It's called Crisis Relocation Planning and it's at least a year away for California. There's a pilot CRP project under way in Arizona. That's all. The Soviets have been doing it for years.

On its face, the plan arguably is unworkable. Is it possible Hayward, for example, can move to, say, Humboldt County? Carter says yes. Eastbay civil-defense officials aren't so certain.

First of all, there's the question of transportation. Enough vehicles could legally be commandeered, but motorized evacuation nevertheless amounts to an uncertain, random process of cramming small groups of people into anything that rolls.

Contra Costa's Perry shrugs off this apparent problem. "You save people in twos and threes," he claims.

Secondly, there is some question as to how well city people would be received in Humboldt County and other areas considered to be relatively safe in time of nuclear war.

"What happens if Farmer Brown tells you to jam it?" asks Oakland's Romero.

In contrast, Perry asserts that in a disaster nearly everyone is willing to cooperate. "Farmer Brown," he argues, would be happy to slaughter his cows to feed refugees.

Perry says the actual problem is making certain there are enough cows to feed those who are relocated and enough beds for them to sleep in. He's waiting for Carter to show him that

survivors of a nuclear war will be able to find some sanctuary other than a hole in the ground.

But the biggest problem with CRP, Eastbay civil-defense officials say, is its slowness. Today it would take Soviet nuclear devices 30 minutes to reach this nation.

Garrigan says, however, five to seven days would be needed to evacuate Alameda County. That means an enemy intent on slaughtering us would have to have the courtesy to give us sufficient lead time to set crisis relocation in motion.

Obviously this won't happen. In the minds of U.S. defense planners, however, there is a way out: surveillance.

If the Soviets began to evacuate their cities or show any other signs of preparation for war, the federal government would order the people of Hayward up to Humboldt or another relatively safe place.

"The latest I hear from the feds," explains Garrigan, "is that we're not going to have an attack. We'll see a world crisis build up for a few days and Washington will give us advance warning."

Perry is doubtful. He says time is too indefinite a factor, that CRP really is based on a fallacious concept. Adequately maintained shelters still are crucial, he believes.

"Have a whole damn basket filled with eggs!" urges Perry.

"Until people learn to live together, there's nothing to preclude nuclear war."